

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria. Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/729,535	12/05/2003	Jang Hyeon-Yong	1190860-991330	1908
26379	7590 06/13/2006	6 EXAMINER		
DLA PIPER RUDNICK GRAY CARY US, LLP 2000 UNIVERSITY AVENUE			VU, DAVID HUNG	
E. PALO ALTO, CA 94303-2248			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2828	

DATE MAILED: 06/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			./-
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/729,535	HYEON-YONG, JANG	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David Vu	2828	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	-
• •	, 10 OFT TO EVEIDE A MONTH	0) 00 THURTY (00) DAY(
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tirr ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	I. lely filed the mailing date of this communication (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 Ma	arch 2006.		
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan		secution as to the merits	is
closed in accordance with the practice under E			
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.			•
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	n from consideration.		
5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>14-22</u> is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5,7,12,13,23-25,27 and 28</u> is/are rej	ected.		
7) Claim(s) <u>6,8-11,26 and 29-32</u> is/are objected to).		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine			
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce	epted or b) objected to by the E	Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the o	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti			(d).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:		-(d) or (f).	
1. Certified copies of the priority documents		All	
2. Certified copies of the priority documents3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	• •		
application from the International Bureau	•	d in this National Stage	
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	d	
	or the definited deplete flot rederive	u .	
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary		
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P	ite atent Application (PTO-152)	
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	++ (

Application/Control Number: 10/729,535 Page 2

Art Unit: 2828

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 1-5, 7, 12-13, 23, and 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Noma et al (hereinafter Noma), U.S. Pat No 6,184,631.

Noma discloses the claimed invention including a light emitting device 7 which is a cold cathode lamp in a liquid crystal display apparatus inherently having a display panel and electric field generating electrodes; a voltage supply coupled to the light emitting device for making a current flow through the light emitting device; an electrically conductive device 9 positioned a predetermined distance away from the light emitting device for generating a voltage in response to the current flowing through the light emitting device; and a status determining device 32-33 for determining the status of the light emitting device based on the voltage from the electrically conductive device, see, for example, abstract, column 1, lines 1-15, column 2, lines 15+, column 3, column 14, lines 45-56, column 18, lines 1-21, claim 11, figures 9 and 13.

Regarding claims 2-4, 7, 28, the status determining device comprises a shut off device for stopping the current from flowing through the light emitting device if the voltage fulfills a predefined condition. The predefined condition comprises the voltage being in a predefined range. The predefined condition indicates that the light emitting

device is operating abnormally. The voltage having a level below a threshold value indicates that the light emitting device is operating abnormally.

Regarding claim 5, "rectifier circuit" 27b,R11 having a first node and a second node, wherein the first node is connected to the electrically conductive device 9 and the second node is connected to a "signal detector" 27a, R27.

Regarding claim 12, the light emitting device 7 is a cold cathode fluorescent lamp.

Regarding claim 13, the light emitting device switches on and off periodically at a predetermined on/off duty ratio.

Regarding claim 23, the claimed method is inherent in the Noma reference.

3. Claims 1-5, 7, 12-13, 23, and 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nakanishi et al (hereinafter Nakanishi), U.S. Pat No 6,407,480.

Nakanishi discloses the claimed invention including a light emitting device 203 which is a cold cathode lamp in a liquid crystal display apparatus inherently having a display panel and electric field generating electrodes; a voltage supply coupled to the light emitting device for making a current flow through the light emitting device; an electrically conductive device 219 positioned a predetermined distance away from the light emitting device for generating a voltage in response to the current flowing through the light emitting device; and a status determining device 226 for determining the status of the light emitting device based on the voltage from the electrically conductive device, see, for example, abstract, column 4, lines 32+, columns 5-12, column 21, lines 35-43, column 56, lines 24+, column 57, column 58, lines 1-17, figure 52.

Regarding claims 2-4, 7, 28, the status determining device comprises a shut off

device for stopping the current from flowing through the light emitting device if the voltage fulfills a predefined condition. The predefined condition comprises the voltage being in a predefined range. The predefined condition indicates that the light emitting device is operating abnormally. The voltage having a level below a threshold value indicates that the light emitting device is operating abnormally.

Regarding claim 5, "rectifier circuit" 251C,251D having a first node and a second node, wherein the first node is connected to the electrically conductive device 219 and the second node is connected to a "signal detector" 251A, 251B.

Regarding claim 12, the light emitting device 203 is a cold cathode fluorescent lamp.

Regarding claim 13, the light emitting device switches on and off periodically at a predetermined on/off duty ratio.

Regarding claim 23, the claimed method is inherent in the Nakanishi reference.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Noma in view of Kouno et al (hereinafter Kouno), U.S. Pat No 6,075,325.

Noma, as discussed from the above, essentially discloses the claimed invention but fails to explicitly disclose a plurality of light emitting devices. Kouno discloses a plurality of cold cathode lamps 3 (figure 1). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's claimed invention was made to have provided the Noma reference with a plurality of lamps; thus, more light energy would have been generated.

Regarding claim 25, since the claim language is broad, the combination of Noma and Kouno inherently discloses a method in which the "error prevention signal" (signal coming out from rectifier 9) is generated if any of the light emitting devices is in a normal inactive state; and the "error prevention signal" is used for the determining of whether any of the light emitting devices is in an abnormal operational state.

6. Claims 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakanishi in view of Kouno et al (hereinafter Kouno), U.S. Pat No 6,075,325.

Nakanishi, as discussed from the above, essentially discloses the claimed invention but fails to explicitly disclose a plurality of light emitting devices. Kouno discloses a plurality of cold cathode lamps 3 (figure 1). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's claimed invention was made to have provided the Nakanishi reference with a plurality of lamps; thus, more light energy would have been generated.

Regarding claim 25, since the claim language is broad, the combination of Nakanishi and Kouno inherently discloses a method in which the "error prevention signal" (signal coming out from 219,251) is generated if any of the light emitting devices

Application/Control Number: 10/729,535 Page 6

Art Unit: 2828

is in a normal inactive state; and the "error prevention signal" is used for the determining of whether any of the light emitting devices is in an abnormal operational state.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 7. Claims 6, 8-11, 26, 29-32 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 8. Claims 14-22 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed on 3/27/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's main argument centers around the newly added limitation "...spaced apart..." and that references by Noma and Nakanishi disclose there is "hard connection" between the electrically conductive device and light emitting device. The Examiner disagrees. Applicant's arguments are not commensurate with the scope of the claims. Reading broadly, "spaced apart" most likely carries the meaning of being separated by a distance. Noma and Nakanishi disclose, e.g., figure 52 of Nakanish and 2 of Noma, the electrically conductive device and light emitting device are clearly spaced apart, separated by a distance. Since the claims recite the electrically conductive device and light emitting device are being spaced apart, obviously the disclosure in both references meets the claim language in the broadest claim interpretation.

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Vu whose telephone number is (571) 272-1831. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am-430pm.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/729,535 Page 8

Art Unit: 2828

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

David Vu

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2828